

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16, 18-24, 26, 28-48 are pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Listing of Claims, Applicants have amended Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-14, 16, 18, 19, 21-24, 26, 28, 29, 32-34, 36-38, 40-43, 45 and 47. Claims 49-51 have been added.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28, 30, 43, 45 and 47 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 3-4, 6, 9, 13-14, 16, 19, 23-24, 26, 29, 31-42, 44, 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28, 30, 43, 45 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,227 issued to Rangachari et al. ("*Rangachari*").

A. Independent Claim 1 is Patently Distinct over *Rangachari*

Claim 1 as amended recites, among other things, "receiving a first message in a first selected protocol," "receiving a second message in a second selected protocol," wherein "said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol." Both messages identify objects in "an equipment model of said tool." In other words, the present invention allows different client applications to interface using different protocols to tools represented by a single equipment model.

Rangachari describes details of a material handling system in which object oriented programming is used to interface between applications and equipment. *Rangachari* does not disclose a tool server, such as in a preferred embodiment of the present invention, in which a multi-protocol capability exists. In a preferred embodiment, application interface units are used to interface client applications to a logical representation of equipment, and tool interfaces are used to interface to actual tools. In this way, details such as whether data being requested comes from an asynchronous or synchronous source need not be known to the client application.

Rangachari does not teach or suggest a single equipment model that can accept messages to perform actions on tools from two client applications utilizing two different

protocols. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Rangachari*.

B. Dependent Claims 2, 8, 10, and 43 Patently Distinguish over *Rangachari*

Dependent Claims 2, 8, 10 and 43 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 2, 8, 10 and 43 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above concerning independent Claim 1.

C. Independent Claim 11 is Patently Distinct over *Rangachari*

Claim 11 as amended recites, among other things, “programming operable for receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “programming operable for receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” For at least the same reasons as discussed above regarding Claim 1, Applicants assert that Claim 11 is not anticipated by *Rangachari*.

D. Dependent Claims 12, 18, 20, and 45 Patently Distinguish over *Rangachari*

Dependent Claims 12, 18, 20 and 45 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 11. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 12, 18, 20 and 45 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above concerning independent Claim 11.

E. Independent Claim 21 is Patently Distinct over *Rangachari*

Claim 21 as amended recites, among other things, “receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” For at least the same reasons as discussed above regarding Claim 1, Applicants assert that Claim 21 is not anticipated by *Rangachari*.

F. Dependent Claims 22, 28, 30, and 47 Patently Distinguish over *Rangachari*

Dependent Claims 22, 28, 30 and 47 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 21. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 20, 22, 28 and 47 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above concerning independent Claim 21.

II. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-4, 6, 9, 13-14, 16, 19, 23-24, 26, 29, 44, 46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rangachari* in view of U.S. Patent 6,463,352 issued to Tadakoro et al. (“*Tadakoro*”). In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 31-32, 35-36 and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rangachari* in view of U.S. Patent 6,658,571 issued to O’Brien et al. (“*O’Brien*”). In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 33-34, 37-38 and 41-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rangachari* and *O’Brien* in view of *Tadokoro*.

Ragachari in view of Tadakoro

A. Dependent Claims 3-4, 6, 9 and 44 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

Dependent Claims 3-4, 6, 9 and 44 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 1. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 1 as amended recites, among other things, “receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” Both messages identify objects in “an equipment model of said tool.” In other words, the present invention allows different client applications to interface using different protocols to tools represented by a single equipment model.

Ragachari in view of *Tadakoro* does not teach or suggest a single equipment model that can accept messages to perform actions on tools from two client applications utilizing two different protocols. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 3-4, 6, 9 and 44 are not obvious over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

B. Dependent Claims 13-14, 16, 19 and 46 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

Dependent Claims 13-14, 16, 19 and 46 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 11. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 11 as amended recites, among other things, “programming operable for receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “programming operable for receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to dependent Claims 3-4, 6, 9 and 44, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 13-14, 16, 19 and 46 are not obvious over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

C. Dependent Claims 23-24, 26, 29 and 48 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

Dependent Claims 23-24, 26, 29 and 48 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 21. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 21 as amended recites, among other things, “receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to dependent Claims 3-4, 6, 9 and 44, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 23-24, 26, 29 and 48 are not obvious over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

***Rangachari* in view of O'Brien**

D. Dependent Claims 31-32 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* in view of O'Brien.

Dependent Claims 31-32 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 1. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 1 as amended recites, among other things, “receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” Both messages identify objects in “an equipment model of said tool.” In other

words, the present invention allows different client applications to interface using different protocols to tools represented by a single equipment model.

Ragachari in view of *O'Brien* does not teach or suggest a single equipment model that can accept messages to perform actions on tools from two client applications utilizing two different protocols. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 31-32 are not obvious over *Rangachari* in view of *Tadakoro*.

E. Dependent Claims 35-36 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* in view of *O'Brien*.

Dependent Claims 35-36 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 11. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 11 as amended recites, among other things, "programming operable for receiving a first message in a first selected protocol," "programming operable for receiving a second message in a second selected protocol," wherein "said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol." For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to dependent Claims 31-32, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 35-36 are not obvious over *Rangachari* in view of *O'Brien*.

F. Dependent Claims 39-40 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* in view of *O'Brien*.

Dependent Claims 39-40 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 21. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 21 as amended recites, among other things, "receiving a first message in a first selected protocol," "receiving a second message in a second selected protocol," wherein "said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol." For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to dependent Claims 31-32, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 39-40 are not obvious over *Rangachari* in view of *O'Brien*.

Ragachari* and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro

G. Dependent Claims 33-34 Patently Distinguishes over *Rangachari* and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro*.

Dependent Claims 33-34 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 1. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 1 as amended recites, among other things, “receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” Both messages identify objects in “an equipment model of said tool.” In other words, the present invention allows different client applications to interface using different protocols to tools represented by a single equipment model.

Ragachari and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro* does not teach or suggest a single equipment model that can accept messages to perform actions on tools from two client applications utilizing two different protocols. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 33-34 are not obvious over *Ragachari* and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro*.

**H. Dependent Claims 37-38 Patently Distinguishes over
Rangachari and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro*.**

Dependent Claims 37-38 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 11. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 11 as amended recites, among other things, “programming operable for receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “programming operable for receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first selected protocol.” For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to dependent Claims 33-34, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 37-38 are not obvious over *Ragachari* and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro*.

**I. Dependent Claims 41-42 Patently Distinguishes over
Rangachari and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro*.**

Dependent Claims 41-42 depend directly and indirectly from independent Claim 21. These dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Claim 21 as amended recites, among other things, “receiving a first message in a first selected protocol,” “receiving a second message in a second selected protocol,” wherein “said second selected protocol is different than said first

selected protocol." For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to dependent Claims 33-34, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 41-42 are not obvious over *Ragachari* and *O'Brien* in view of *Tadakoro*.

Additional Remarks

New Claim 49 depends directly from independent Claim 1, new Claim 50 depends directly from independent Claim 11 and new Claim 51 depends directly from independent Claim 21. These new dependent claims includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. For at least the same reasons discussed above, Applicants assert that new Claims 49-51 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by any reference of record, either singly or in combination.

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application are allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, May 28, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0639 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time or addition of new claims, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/28/05

By: 

Stephen Melvin
Reg. No. 50,467

Stephen Melvin, Ph.D.
Patent Agent
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3344
Telephone: (415) 984-8700
Facsimile: (415) 984-8701
Email: smelvin@omm.com

SF1:573031.1